

## REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement set forth by the Examiner, Applicant elects Group I (Claims 1-26) for further prosecution and withdraws Group II (Claims 27-40) without prejudice. Thus, Claims 27-40 were cancelled, and Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended.

Support for amendments to Claims 1 and 15 can be found on page 6, lines 12-14 and page 8, lines 4-6, respectively, of the specification.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 3-12 and 17-26 would be allowable if they were rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any respective intervening claims.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Stikvoort et al.* (US 2004/0125240). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might applied to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 now recites "a complex sinusoid signal IFLO, coupled to said down converter, for providing a complex sinusoid signal to said down converter." Similarly, amended Claim 15 now recites a step of "providing a complex sine wave for down converting said in-phase IF signal and said quadrature IF signal." The claimed complex sinusoid signal IFLO and the claimed complex sine wave are not found in *Stikvoort* because IF mixer 13 in Figure 1, for example, receives a non-complex sine wave from local oscillator 3.

Claims 1-2 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Isaksson et al.* (US 5,812,523). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might applied to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 recites an LO frequency control module, a down converter, a complex sinusoid signal IFLO, and a down conversion controller.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner characterizes the "frequency control of LO at the down converter" located on the legend of Figure 1 of *Isaksson* as the claimed LO frequency control module. The Examiner then characterizes "the complex multiplier" in Figure 1 of *Isaksson* as the claimed down converter. The Examiner also characterizes "the frequency control signal" in Figure 1 of *Isaksson* as the claimed down conversion controller. However, col. 5, lines 41-48 of *Isaksson* states that

The NCO generates a complex rotating vector which is multiplied with the incoming digitized signal, in order to compensate for the frequency error. An alternative, to this method of digitally correcting the incoming data signal, is to control the local oscillators which are used for down mixing from radio frequencies.

Thus, according to *Isaksson*, the frequency control signal for the NCO and the frequency control of LO at the down converter are alternatives of each other and do not exist together (hence, the frequency control of LO is shown via phantom lines in Figure 1). In contrast, the claimed radio frequency receiver includes both the LO frequency control module and the down conversion controller.

In addition, the "frequency control of LO at the down converter" located on the legend of Figure 1 of *Isaksson* is for frequency control of LO at the down converter, as stated. In contrast, the claimed LO frequency control module is coupled to the LO located at the first and second mixers stage (not shown in *Isaksson*), which is located before the down converter.

Furthermore, *Isaksson* does not teach or suggest the claimed complex sinusoid signal IFLO.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by either *Stikvoort* or *Isaksson*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicant believes independent Claims 1 and 15 along with their respective dependent claims are distinguished over the cited references under § 102, and should be in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against Dillon & Yudell Deposit Account No. 50-3083.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
Registration No. 43,427  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT